

Remarks

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 10-29 are pending in the application, with claims 10, 20, and 28 being the independent claims. Claims 1-9 were previously cancelled. Claims 10 and 28 are sought to be amended in response to the Office Action. Claim 13 is sought to be amended to include an "and" that was inadvertently omitted. The title is sought to be amended in response to the Examiner's request. The specification is also sought to be amended to update the continuity information. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Objection to the Title

In response to the Examiner's request for a new title (Office Action, page 2, paragraph 2), the title of the application is amended herein to read, "System and Method for Sequencing of Signals Applied to a Circuit." Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Objections to the Specification

In response to the Examiner's request that the continuity data be updated (Office Action, page 2, paragraph 3), the specification is amended herein to update the patent number of a related patent application that had not yet been granted at the time of filing the present application. The Examiner also requested that the word "interfacial" be amended to --interface-- on page 8, line 10, of the present specification. Applicant would like to point out

that the word "interfacial" is used properly as an adjective numerous times throughout the specification in similar instances as the instance on page 8, line 10. Applicant does believe, however, that the word "interfacial" on page 8, *line 11*, should read --interface-- because it is used as a verb. The amendment of "interfacial" to --interface-- on page 8, line 11, can be found in the Preliminary Amendment filed on October 21, 2003. Applicant does not plan on amending any other instances of the word "interfacial" unless absolutely necessary. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that these objections to the specification be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office Action states on page 2 (paragraph 5) that claims 10-19 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action states that "the state" in independent claim 10 and "the application" in independent claim 28 lack antecedent basis. In response to these rejections, claim 10 is amended herein to change "the state" to --a state-- and claim 28 is amended herein to change "the application" to --an application--. The Office action also states that "the state of the first signal" in line 5 of claim 28 lacks antecedent basis. Applicant respectfully disagrees because "a state of the first signal" is introduced in the preamble. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 10-19 and 28-29 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Office Action states on page 3 (paragraph 6) that claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Office Action states that the bias generation circuit as claimed in claim 10 is not as it is shown in the specification in Figure 4. Applicant agrees with the Examiner that it is more correct to state that the bias generation circuit generates a plurality of

gate control signals from the *third* signal as output from the comparison circuit. Applicant has amended claim 10 accordingly herein. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection of claim 10 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Nonstatutory Double Patenting Rejection

The Office Action states on page 4 (paragraph 8) that claims 10-27 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,671,816 B1. In response to this rejection, Applicant has filed herewith a Terminal Disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.321(c) to overcome the double patenting rejection. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the double patenting rejection of claims 10-27 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Agnes N. Woo
Appl. No. 10/689,489

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Robert Sokohl
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 36,013

Date: 8/2/05

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

424818_1.DOC